

**CELLULAR COMMUNICATIONS
ADVISORY COMMITTEE
UNAPPROVED MINUTES**

Facilitator: Dr. Navita James, University of South Florida
Facilitator: Dr. David Payne, University of South Florida

Recap of Meeting on April 12, 2011 at 5:00 p.m.
County Center

Members

The following Cellular Communications Advisory Committee members were present:

Stephanie Agliano	Laura Belflower	Will Bissett
Michael Brooks	Richard Davis	Carrie Grimail
Dr. Tom Mason	Manuel Perotin	Jim Porter
Michael Rothenberg	Lee Vaughn	Denise Verrill
Dr. Tom Weller	Lisa Williams	

Welcome

Dr. Navita James welcomed the committee members and explained that the meeting is being televised live, as well as audio and closed captioning are being made. The audio and closed captioning will be posted to the CCAC website.

Approval of March 8, 2011 Minutes

The motion to approve the March 8 minutes with no changes was made by Dr. Tom Mason and seconded by Dr. Tom Weller. The motion was approved unanimously.

Approval of April 12 Agenda

The motion to accept the agenda for April 12 with no changes was made by Dr. Tom Mason and seconded by Michael Rothenburg and was accepted unanimously.

Dr. James introduced three members of the committee who were not present at the March 8th meeting and asked them to introduce themselves to the committee members. Staff and several observers were present and introduced themselves to the committee as well.

Statement of Goals and Concerns

Dr. James reviewed the proposed goals and possible outcomes with the committee. The stated goals of the committee are to provide the County Administrator with informed recommendations regarding the issues relating to the location, construction, and regulation of cell phone towers and

to the governmental procedures used to make decisions concerning the location and construction of cell phone towers in Hillsborough County. A further goal is to make recommendations for changes to codes and procedures regulating the location and construction of cell phone towers in Hillsborough County.

The committee agreed to replace “cell phone towers” with “wireless communication support structures and facilities” to include the structures as well as the associated equipment attached to the towers.

Discussion ensued regarding the permitting process for location and construction of the structures and associated equipment, including the “refrigerator boxes” and the small boxes attached to telephone poles that serve as antennas. The committee was advised by staff that the county regulates the placement of towers, but not the placement of equipment on the towers.

The committee voted to not agree to a suggestion to change the language in the first goal to include the regulation of the location and construction of cell towers. The committee did agree to change “cell phone towers” to “wireless communication structures and facilities” in the goals.

Discussion then proceeded to the Areas of Concern, which identified the issues the committee will review and discuss. These issues include (1) neighborhood and property concerns; (2) cell phone tower approval process; and (3) use of public school properties. After discussion on the issues, the committee agreed to add another area of concern, that of “other institutional properties”. The basic wording would be identical to item (3) of the concerns.

The potential outcomes were reviewed and discussed. The committee agreed that the first possible outcome would be where a simple majority of the committee reaches a consensus on a recommendation. The second possible outcome would be that a simple majority of committee is not able to reach a consensus on an issue, but recommends that the issue needs further review/study. The final outcome would be that the committee is not able to achieve any consensus on the issue. A “Dissenting Report” could be prepared on any recommendation not agreed to by a majority of the committee members. This report would be required to be made available to the entire committee.

The final report to the County Administrator will include reports from each possible outcome.

Order of Discussion for Areas of Concern

The committee agreed to begin the discussion with the report from Wade-Trim regarding the comparative study of ordinances locally and statewide.

Discussion of Wade Trim Comparative Study of Committee Codes

Mr. David Gildersleeve of Wade-Trim provided an overview of the comparative study of community codes and gave a brief overview of the significant findings. Items of discussion included variances to code requirements and setbacks from other uses. A copy of the study was provided to each committee member and will be posted to the county website.

Any changes or corrections to the study should be addressed to Joe Moreda, who will forward the requests to Wade-Trim for review/response.

Overview of the Hillsborough County Code

Managing County Attorney, Adam Gormly, provided an overview of the Hillsborough County Land Development Code regulations and the state regulations regarding the wireless communication support structures and wireless communication antennas. Items of discussion included administrative reviews and special use reviews. Administrative reviews look at code compliance and are not required to have a noticed public hearing. The special use review requires a noticed public hearing before a land use hearing officer.

Topics of discussion included setbacks and variances to the regulations. Other restrictions to the wireless communication support structures are contained in state and federal laws and will be discussed at a later date.

Agenda Items for Next Meeting

The committee agreed to review the Land Development Code regulations in detail at the next meeting. The meeting will also focus on the neighborhood and property issues. Staff will prepare a document for the next meeting which will include information on setbacks and a review of changes to the code on the wireless communication support towers.

Proposed Meeting Dates

The committee agreed to meet every third Wednesday, beginning on May 4th, and continuing on to May 25th, June 15th, July 6th and July 27th.

With no further business, the meeting adjourned at 7:08 p.m.